United Nations A/67/315

General Assembly

Distr.: General
17 August 2012

Original: English

Sixty-seventh session
Item 76 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Oceans and the law of the sea

Sustainable fisheries, including through the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, and related instruments

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report has been prepared pursuant to paragraph 163 of General Assembly resolution 66/68. It contains information on actions taken by the international community in response to the provisions of the resolution. The report has been based on contributions provided by States, relevant specialized agencies, in particular the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and other appropriate organs, organizations and programmes of the United Nations system, subregional and regional organizations and arrangements for the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks, as well as other relevant intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations.

* A/67/150.

12-46699 (E) 231012

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Achieving sustainable fisheries	4
III.	Implementation of international instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources	7
	A. Implementation of the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement	8
	B. Implementation of fishery instruments of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	10
IV.	Promoting responsible fisheries in the marine ecosystem	11
	A. Ecosystem approaches, data collection and scientific research	12
	B. Addressing the impacts of bottom fishing	13
	C. Marine protected areas for fisheries purposes	15
	D. Addressing the issue of marine debris	16
	E. Achieving sustainable aquaculture	16
V.	Addressing unsustainable fishing practices	17
	A. Compliance and enforcement and monitoring, control and surveillance	18
	B. Measures to address illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing	19
	C. Measures to address other unsustainable fishing activities	23
VI.	International cooperation to promote sustainable fisheries	27
	A. Subregional and regional cooperation through regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements	27
	B. International cooperation to enhance capacity-building	29
	C. Cooperation and coordination within the United Nations system	32
VII.	Concluding remarks	32
Annex		
	List of respondents to the questionnaire	34

I. Introduction

1. The international community continues to face the significant challenge of trying to meet increasing demands for fish as food, while ensuring the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources.[1] Globally, fish provides approximately 4.3 billion people with about 15 per cent of their intake of animal protein, as well as livelihoods and income for a significant portion of the world's population.[2] The state of the world's fish stocks, however, has not kept pace with population growth and the expansion of trade.[3]

2. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the proportion of fully exploited stocks increased from 43 per cent in 1989 to 57 per cent in 2009, while approximately 30 per cent of stocks were overexploited. The remaining 13 per cent of stocks were non-fully exploited in 2009, but often lacked high production potential. Among the seven principal tuna species, one third were estimated to be overexploited, 37.5 per cent were fully exploited, and 29 per cent were non-fully exploited in 2009.[4]

3. In addition to fishing pressures, including overfishing, overcapacity and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU fishing), fisheries are subject to a wide range of other impacts that threatened their sustainability, most notably, impacts resulting from climate change, pollution and habitat degradation. It is unlikely, in these circumstances, that the target contained in the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation), which demanded that stocks be maintained or restored to the level that can produce the maximum sustainable yield by 2015, will be met.

4. In resolution 66/68, the General Assembly agreed on actions that needed to be taken by the international community to achieve sustainable fisheries, including through implementation of international fisheries instruments, promotion of responsible fisheries in the marine ecosystem, addressing unsustainable fishing practices and enhancing international cooperation. The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to bring the resolution to the attention of members of the international community and invite them to provide information relevant to its implementation.

5. The Secretary-General, accordingly, circulated a questionnaire to States, relevant specialized agencies, in particular FAO, and other appropriate organs,

---

[1] Capture fisheries and aquaculture supplied the world with approximately 148 million tonnes of fish in 2010 (with a total value of US$217.5 billion), of which about 128 million tonnes was utilized as food for people. Global recorded production of the world's marine fisheries was 77.4 million tonnes in 2010. World per capita food fish consumption increased from an average of 9.9 kg in the 1960s to 18.4 kg in 2009 (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2012*).

[2] Fisheries and aquaculture provided livelihoods and income for an estimated 54.8 million people engaged in the primary sector of fish production in 2010. Numerous jobs were also provided in ancillary activities, such as processing and distribution. Total employment in the sector was estimated to support the livelihoods of between 660 and 820 million people, including dependents, or approximately 10 to 12 per cent of the world's population (*The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2012*).

[3] Between 1976 and 2010, world trade in fish and fishery products rose from $8 billion to $102 billion (*The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2012*).

[4] FAO, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2012*.

organizations and programmes of the United Nations system, subregional and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements (RFMO/As), as well as other relevant intergovernmental bodies and non-governmental organizations to solicit their contributions.

6. The present report contains information on the actions taken by the international community in response to the provisions of the resolution, based on the replies received by the Secretary-General (see annex), for which he expresses his appreciation. Compared to previous reports, the coverage in the present report has been reduced, owing to word limits for parliamentary documents.

II. Achieving sustainable fisheries

7. The international community has recognized the crucial role of healthy marine ecosystems and sustainable fisheries for food security and nutrition and in providing for the livelihoods of millions of people, as well as the need to promote, enhance and support more sustainable fisheries.[5] It has also recognized that international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, provides the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans and their resources.[6]

8. A wide range of actions were taken, in response to General Assembly resolution 66/68, to improve the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources. Many of these actions were also promoted in other forums, including the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 20 to 22 June 2012 (Rio+20). In this context, respondents stressed the need to address the sustainable development of fisheries, while giving priority to oceans and fisheries issues and advancing the green economy for oceans (European Union, New Zealand and United States of America).

9. Some respondents reported on actions to implement the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (European Union and United States), including by developing recovery plans to rebuild fish stocks. A number of respondents also reported on high-level national strategies or new legislation to improve the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources (Bahrain, European Union, Kuwait, Mexico, New Zealand and United States). The European Union stated that it was conducting an ambitious reform of its common fisheries policy, in order to bring all fish stocks above maximum sustainable yield (MSY) levels, including through the gradual elimination of discards, introduction of multiannual multispecies plans, application of the precautionary and ecosystem approaches and combating IUU fishing. The United States of America adopted a national ocean policy in 2010 to develop comprehensive, regional coastal and marine spatial plans throughout its waters by 2015.

10. Many respondents took action to apply the precautionary approach in fisheries management decisions when information on stocks was uncertain or inadequate (European Union, New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States, and the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO), the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), and the Western Central Atlantic Fishery

[5] See General Assembly resolution 66/288, paras. 111 and 113.

[6] See General Assembly resolution 66/288, para. 158.

Commission (WECAFC)). NAFO established precautionary reference points for eight of its stocks and managed other stocks under management strategies or conservation plans and rebuilding strategies to minimize fishing mortality. Work continued on the establishment of meaningful reference points for its remaining stocks. Several respondents were also working to apply an ecosystem approach to the conservation, management and exploitation of fish stocks (European Union, Mexico and United States, and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), NAFO, NEAFC and WECAFC). The United States was implementing regional initiatives to explore new collaborative approaches to improve habitats and inform future actions on coastal and marine habitat loss and degradation.

11. A number of respondents took a wide range of other conservation and management measures to address, inter alia, by-catch, overfishing, destructive fishing practices and habitat degradation, including through catch limits, gear restrictions or prohibitions, and spatial, temporal or effort restrictions (Bahrain, European Union, Kuwait, Mexico, Russian Federation, United States). The European Union reported on measures to ensure the long-term sustainability of certain deep sea fish stocks. The Russian Federation was migrating to a system of long-term assignment of fishery quotas, for periods of 10 years, in order to promote rationalized resource use.

12. Some respondents reported on activities to improve the work of RFMO/As in the conservation and sustainable management of fisheries (European Union, Mexico, New Zealand and United States). Some RFMO/As also reported on progress in the adoption of measures or decisions (CCAMLR, the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) and WECAFC). In 2011, ICCAT adopted measures on decision-making and the use of best available science, including adoption of the Kobe strategy matrices and plot charts and on harmonization of by-catch and discard data collection. A multiannual measure to ensure the long term conservation of tropical tunas was also adopted.

13. Several respondents took action to improve scientific research in the development of conservation and management measures, including in RFMO/As (European Union, Mexico, New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States). In the European Union, the proportion of stocks for which no scientific advice was available fell from 52 per cent in 2006 to 36 per cent in 2012. In the United States, all scientific information having a clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions was required to be peer-reviewed.

14. A number of respondents also reported on specific scientific activities on data collection, by-catch, ecosystem modelling, stock assessments and impact assessments (European Union, New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States). Observer programmes were being developed or implemented to improve data collection, including in RFMO/As (New Zealand and United States, and NAFO and NEAFC). Some RFMO/As were also promoting science or improving collection and reporting of catch and effort data to support scientific and management processes (CCAMLR, ICCAT, NAFO, NEAFC and WECAFC) (see also sect. IV of the present report).

15. Respondents expressed support for the implementation and development of the Fishery Resources Monitoring System initiative of FAO (United States and CCAMLR, NEAFC and NAFO). FAO reported that the initiative was focused on

enhancing the quality and coverage of information in sustainable ways. Between 2010 and 2011, the rate of contributions of information increased from 16 to 22 per cent and the marine resources inventory now includes more than 1,000 resources and stocks.

Conservation and management of sharks

16. A number of respondents took steps to ensure the long-term conservation, management and sustainable use of shark stocks (European Union, Mexico, New Zealand and United States), including through scientific research, observer programmes, gear restrictions, spatial, temporal or effort restrictions and species protections. Some States (New Zealand and United States) also reported on the development or review of national plans of action to implement the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks).

17. Some States were prohibiting or restricting fisheries conducted solely to harvest shark fins, or requiring sharks to be landed with their fins naturally attached (Mexico, New Zealand and United States). In New Zealand, finning a live shark and returning the shark trunk to the sea while alive was an offence under its animal welfare legislation. A prohibition on shark finning also applied to its high seas vessels within the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) area.

18. States also reported on efforts to implement and improve measures in RFMO/As on the conservation and management of sharks (New Zealand and United States). Several RFMO/As also reported on progress in regulating sharks (CCAMLR, NAFO, NEAFC and WECAFC). In CCAMLR, directed fishing for sharks, other than for scientific purposes, was prohibited. NEAFC banned shark finning and the use of gill and entangling nets in depths below 200 metres. It also banned directed fisheries for several shark species. Shark finning was prohibited in NAFO and shark by-catches were to be reported on a species level whenever possible, starting in 2012.

19. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported on its review of the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks.[7] It also developed identification tools for commercially exploited and potentially vulnerable species to improve identification and data collection. The Pew Environment Group reported on its recent assessment of the nature and extent of management measures in place for sharks and highlighted the lack of comprehensive species-specific shark assessments, making it difficult to evaluate the International Plan of Action.

20. The secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) reported on a memorandum of understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks that came into effect in 2010 and aimed to achieve and maintain a favourable conservation status for these species, based on the best available scientific information. A conservation plan for sharks would also be discussed in 2012.

[7] See FAO documents COFI/2012/SBD.8 and COFI/2012/3/Add.1/Rev.1.

Small-scale fisheries

21. Some respondents were taking action to improve the participation of small-scale fishery stakeholders in fisheries policy development and management strategies (United States and WECAFC). WECAFC reported on a regional workshop, held in Barbados, in December 2011, which recommended that small-scale fisheries organizations should be strengthened to become true partners in the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and responsible fisheries management, in general. It also recommended efforts to better document the features and contributions of small-scale fisheries in the region, capturing in particular the socioeconomic aspects.

22. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported on the development of its draft international guidelines for securing sustainable small-scale fisheries, which aimed to enhance the contribution of small-scale fisheries to poverty alleviation, food and nutrition security and economic growth. More than 1,100 stakeholders participated in the development process for the draft guidelines and shaped priorities for national policies and measures in support of coastal and inland fishing communities. At the thirtieth session of the Committee on Fisheries of FAO, held in Rome, from 9 to 13 July 2012, the Committee called for continued consultations on the draft guidelines and the convening of technical consultations in May 2013.

23. The organization also noted that significant emphasis was given in its Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends of Capture Fisheries to the improvement of information from the small-scale sector and to capacity-building.

Barriers to trade in fish and fish products

24. Some States (New Zealand and United States) reported on their activities to reduce barriers to trade and address fisheries subsidies that distorted trade and contributed to overfishing, overcapacity and IUU fishing, including in the context of the World Trade Organization (WTO). New Zealand saw individual and joint efforts to reform subsidies as an important complement, not a substitute, to an eventual outcome in the Doha Development Round negotiations.

25. The World Trade Organization reported that its Negotiating Group on Rules received and considered many proposals in which fisheries management systems and measures would form part of eventual new disciplines on fisheries subsidies, including as a possible condition, under new disciplines, for the provision of subsidies that otherwise would be prohibited. Differences remained as to the exact nature and scope of new disciplines on fisheries subsidies and the precise role that would be played in that context by fisheries management systems and measures, and sustainability considerations in general.

III. Implementation of international instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources

26. A wide variety of voluntary and legally binding instruments have been adopted to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of fisheries resources. The international community has stressed the need to implement these instruments through concrete measures at the national, subregional and regional levels.

A. Implementation of the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement

27. The Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (1995 Fish Stocks Agreement), entered into force on 11 December 2001. As of July 2012, there were 78 parties, including the European Union.[8]

1. Implementation of the Agreement

28. A number of parties to the Agreement reported on actions to implement its provisions domestically (European Union, Russian Federation and United States). The United States implemented the Agreement through over 100 national laws and regulations, including the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and the High Seas Fishing Compliance Act.

29. Some non-parties also reported on actions to conserve and manage straddling and highly migratory fish stocks (Bahrain, Kuwait and Mexico). Bahrain cooperated in research efforts with the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (Gulf Cooperation Council) on highly migratory fish and with other members of the Gulf Cooperation Council on bottom fish, including a recent three-year survey on straddling stocks. Mexico reported that its national fisheries policy was consistent with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It also established management measures consistent with the substantive goals of the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement.

30. A number of RFMO/As reported on amendments to their constitutive instruments and other actions to conserve and manage fisheries resources consistent with the Agreement (NAFO, NEAFC, WECAFC). At its fourteenth session, in February 2012, WECAFC adopted a resolution on strengthening the implementation of international fisheries instruments, including the Agreement.

Compliance and enforcement, including high seas boarding and inspection

31. Some respondents reported on actions to implement provisions of the Agreement relating to compliance and enforcement, including through enforcement operations on the high seas (New Zealand and United States). New Zealand undertook boarding and inspections operations in the Pacific Ocean and Southern Ocean in accordance with CCAMLR and WCPFC systems of inspection. In 2011-2012, it conducted the first high seas boarding and inspections of fishing vessels licensed by CCAMLR members to operate in the CCAMLR area.

32. NAFO and NEAFC reported on procedures for high seas boarding and inspection, developed in accordance with the Agreement. NAFO maintained and updated a list of authorized vessels to fish in its regulatory area and measures were adopted for on-board inspections of fishing vessels. The NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement included boarding and inspection functions in accordance with articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

[8] See http://treaties.un.org.

Activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

33. In response to paragraph 35 of General Assembly resolution 66/68, FAO reported that it had collected and disseminated data on vessels authorized to operate in the high seas, regardless of the existence of regional and subregional management arrangements, on the basis of the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas (Compliance Agreement), adopted in 1993. FAO disseminated information on 6,674 vessels, reported by 44 countries. However, access to the information was limited to parties to the Compliance Agreement.[9]

34. The organization was also integrating publicly available vessel information and developing a web portal to enable global search of such information, the testing of which began in July 2012. Simultaneously, FAO collaborated with five tuna regional fisheries management organizations to assist in enhancing their consolidated list of active vessels, following the recommendation of the third joint meeting of the tuna regional fisheries management organizations, held in July 2011, in the United States.

35. With regard to any revision of its global fisheries statistics database, FAO noted that its statistics programme was established to monitor the contribution of fisheries and aquaculture to food security and other socioeconomic factors. The Agreement, on the other hand, indicated that compilation and dissemination of data for stock assessment and management should be conducted principally through RFMO/As. FAO disseminated integrated catch and effort data by gears and location of catch, collected by the five tuna regional fisheries management organizations through the Atlas of Tuna and Billfish Catches.[10] FAO also continued efforts to develop a tool to allow users to access integrated information from multiple sources, which was currently under final review.

2. Implementation of the outcomes of the Review Conference and the resumed Review Conference

36. The resumed Review Conference on the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement, held in New York in May 2010, conducted a review of the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the Review Conference in 2006 and adopted additional recommendations. The Conference recommended that the informal consultations of States parties to the Agreement continue and that the Agreement be kept under review through the resumption of the Review Conference at a date not earlier than 2015.[11]

37. The United States attached great importance to the recommendations from the 2006 Review Conference and the 2010 resumed Review Conference and it continued to press for the implementation of the recommendations bilaterally and at the global and regional levels through relevant RFMO/As.

[9] See http://www.fao.org/figis/vrmf/hsvar/.

[10] Available from www.fao.org/figis/geoserver/tunaatlas/.

[11] See document A/CONF.210/2010/7, annex.

B. Implementation of fishery instruments of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

1. The Compliance Agreement

38. As of July 2012, 39 parties, including the European Union, had accepted the Compliance Agreement.[12] The United States implemented the Compliance Agreement by regulations authorized under its High Seas Fishing Compliance Act, which prohibited high seas fishing vessels from engaging in commercial harvesting operations without a valid permit.

39. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations upgraded its web page in May 2012 and displayed the records of fishing vessels reported by each party, in accordance with article IV of the Compliance Agreement.[9] The new web page provided access to data, which reflected reports in real time, as they were updated, as well as functions to allow members to access and report data directly through the website. Only a limited number of members reported records of vessels and their modifications regularly, which undermined the effectiveness of the Compliance Agreement. FAO urged parties to provide updated information whenever the reported information was modified.

2. Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries

40. A number of respondents took actions or measures to promote and implement the Code of Conduct (Bahrain, Mexico and United States and WECAFC). Bahrain complied with the Code of Conduct and worked to promote sustainable fisheries, including through temporal restrictions and gear restrictions and prohibitions. Mexico managed its fisheries in compliance with the Code of Conduct and stressed that fishing gear selectivity was a key priority. The United States developed an implementation plan for the Code of Conduct, which was revised and updated in 2011.

41. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission reported on a regional policy and planning workshop for the Caribbean on the Code of Conduct, held in Barbados, in December 2011. The workshop recognized the need to strengthen existing frameworks by implementing relevant provisions of the Code of Conduct to ensure long-term sustainable use of fisheries. The conclusions and recommendations of the workshop were subsequently endorsed by WECAFC at its fourteenth session, held in February 2012.

42. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations supported implementation of the Code of Conduct, including through regular and field programme activities.[13] It undertook activities and proposed mechanisms to improve long-term access to, and sharing of, essential information to support implementation. In 2011, FAO conducted an evaluation of its support for implementation of the Code of Conduct, with a particular focus on human capacity development. A number of recommendations were proposed relating to a strategic approach to implementation of the Code of Conduct, in general, and specific code themes.

---

[12] See www.fao.org/legal/treaties/treaties-under-article-xiv/en/.

[13] See document COFI/2012/3.

43. At the thirtieth session of the Committee on Fisheries, delegations welcomed developments to support implementation of the Code of Conduct, including a new safety standard for small fishing vessels and guidelines of FAO, the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) to assist competent authorities in the implementation of voluntary instruments on the design, construction and equipment of all fishing vessels of all types and sizes.[14]

3. International plans of action

44. A number of respondents reported on the adoption of national plans of action to implement the international plans of action of FAO (European Union, New Zealand and United States).[15] With regard to the International Plan of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity, the United States made significant progress in determining causes of overcapacity in its domestic fisheries, including by developing formal metrics to assess levels of capacity and overcapacity and applying those measures to federally managed fisheries. The United States enacted measures to reduce incidental catch of seabirds in its fisheries and continued to implement its national plan of action and actively promote implementation of the International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries within RFMO/As.[16]

45. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission reported on the regional workshop, held in Barbados, in December 2011, which called for the development of national plans of action on sharks and for improvement of data collection on shark catches and landings, in line with FAO technical guidelines on the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks and recommendations from ICCAT.

IV. Promoting responsible fisheries in the marine ecosystem

46. The international community has recognized the importance of protecting and restoring the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems, and the need to maintain their biodiversity, including through the effective application of the precautionary and ecosystem approaches in the management of activities having an impact on the marine environment, such as fisheries.[17] It has also recognized the need to manage adverse ecosystem impacts from fisheries, including by eliminating destructive fishing practices and protecting vulnerable marine ecosystems from significant adverse impacts, as well as the importance of

[14] See document COFI/2012/3 and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *Report of the thirtieth session of the Committee on Fisheries, Rome, 9-13 July 2012, FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No. 1012.*

[15] International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks), International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IPOA-IUU), International Plan of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity (IPOA-Capacity), and the International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries (IPOA-Seabirds).

[16] See sects. II and V of the present report and documents COFI/2012/3 and COFI/2012/3/Add.1/Rev.1.

[17] See General Assembly resolution 66/288, para. 158.

reducing the incidence and impacts of marine pollution on marine ecosystems, including marine debris.[18]

A. Ecosystem approaches, data collection and scientific research

1. Actions taken by States and the European Union

47. Respondents reported on a variety of measures for promoting responsible fisheries while protecting marine ecosystems, including through the application of the precautionary and ecosystem approaches, establishing marine protected areas, protecting vulnerable marine ecosystems, enhancing data collection programmes and increasing scientific research on the marine environment (Bahrain, European Union, Kuwait, Mexico, New Zealand, Philippines, Russian Federation and United States).

48. In promoting responsible fisheries, the European Union developed long-term management plans for fish stocks in the European sea basins, which were subject to an evaluation process to assess their effectiveness. New Zealand launched a significant fisheries strategy in 2008 to achieve improved economic benefit, while protecting the health of the fishery and the marine environment. Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the United States required the establishment of annual catch limits in 2010 for stocks subject to overfishing and in 2011 for all other stocks at levels such that overfishing did not occur. Its national ocean policy also called for the development of comprehensive, regional coastal and marine spatial plans throughout its waters by 2015.

49. Some respondents were taking action to protect important habitats, such as spawning and nursery areas (Bahrain and United States). Bahrain reported on a project to create artificial coral reefs to limit the loss of fisheries due to urban development along its coast. The United States was working to identify the essential habitat for every life stage of each federally managed species, using the best available scientific information.

50. A number of respondents were also taking action to improve scientific research and data collection (Mexico, New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States). Mexico reported on a unique and ground-breaking programme in scientific research, control and monitoring. In 2011, New Zealand introduced a research and science information standard of best practice in the delivery and quality assurance of research and science information for its fisheries. The Russian Federation conducted studies in its exclusive economic zone (EEZ) to assess the status of aquatic biological resources.

2. Actions taken by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and other bodies

51. Regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and other bodies were also taking a wide range of actions to promote responsible fisheries and protect marine ecosystems (CCAMLR, ICCAT, NAFO, NEAFC, WECAFC and the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission)). NAFO took action to prohibit bottom trawling on sensitive habitats, ban shark finning and

[18] See General Assembly resolution 66/288, paras. 163 and 168.

improve sea turtle protection and it continued with its Roadmap for Developing an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries. It also adopted measures to protect the biodiversity of benthic organisms, including important prey species. NEAFC reported that it was incrementally including ecosystem elements in management measures and plans, as scientific knowledge increased.

52. A number of RFMO/As and other bodies were also working to enhance scientific research and data collection on fisheries (CCAMLR, ICCAT, NAFO, NEAFC, WECAFC and the Helsinki Commission). CCAMLR adopted a resolution in 2009 on best available science, recognizing the importance of sound scientific advice as the centrepiece of its ecosystem approach. The Helsinki Commission coordinated monitoring of the Baltic Sea environment under its fish project (FISH-PRO), which carried out an indicator-based assessment of coastal fish community status for the years 2005 to 2009. In the framework of another project, the Commission was also developing core indicators (CORESET) and determining thresholds for good environmental status to assess the state of the Baltic Sea, including its fish stocks.

53. The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas adopted recommendations on establishing minimum standards for domestic fishing vessel scientific observer programmes[19] and on applying penalties for non-reporting of data. It also introduced an electronic scheme for bluefin tuna catch documents. A regional policy and planning workshop organized by WECAFC in 2011 addressed, among other issues, the problem of uncoordinated research efforts and access to information on responsible fisheries and its management. It recommended increased collaboration between fisheries bodies and other organizations to avoid overlaps and focus on consolidating efforts and establishing regional priorities for research.

B. Addressing the impacts of bottom fishing

54. At its sixty-sixth session, the General Assembly conducted a review of the actions taken by States and RFMO/As in response to relevant paragraphs of resolutions 61/105 and 64/72 to address the impacts of bottom fishing on vulnerable marine ecosystems and the long-term sustainability of deep sea fish stocks.[20] Pursuant to paragraph 128 of resolution 64/72, the Secretary-General also convened a two-day workshop to discuss implementation of the relevant paragraphs of those resolutions.

55. The discussions during the workshop were taken into account by the General Assembly in deciding on further urgent actions, as reflected in its resolution 66/68, regarding bottom fishing in areas beyond national jurisdiction.[21] The Assembly also decided to conduct a further review in 2015 of the actions taken by States and RFMO/As in response to its resolutions 64/72 and 66/68, with a view to ensuring effective implementation of the measures and to make further recommendations, where necessary.

---

[19] Contribution of the United States.

[20] See the report of the Secretary-General, A/66/307. Reviews were also conducted in 2006 and 2009.

[21] See document A/66/566 for a summary of the discussions. Also see paras. 122-137 of General Assembly resolution 66/68.

1. Actions taken by States and the European Union

56. A number of respondents reported on actions to address the impacts of bottom fishing on vulnerable marine ecosystems and the long-term sustainability of fish stocks, including in RFMO/As (Bahrain, European Union, New Zealand and United States). Bahrain prohibited the use of bottom trawl nets for fishing and introduced increases in mesh size to prevent the harvesting of young fish. The European Union planned to amend its 2008 regulation on bottom fishing gears to take into account, inter alia, the latest developments at the General Assembly and FAO International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas.[22]

57. The Russian Federation reported on temporary measures to regulate fishing of demersal species and conservation of vulnerable marine ecosystems in the high seas areas of the North Pacific Ocean, in preparation for the new Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean.[23] The United States noted that a moratorium on bottom fisheries was in place in its EEZ immediately adjacent to the southern end of the seamounts where fishing was actively taking place in the North Pacific.

2. Actions taken by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements

58. A number of RFMO/As recalled measures to address the impacts of bottom fishing on vulnerable marine ecosystems and the long-term sustainability of fish stocks, developed in accordance with relevant General Assembly resolutions (CCAMLR, NAFO, NEAFC and the Interim secretariat for the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean). CCAMLR reported that its scientific committee also continued to implement a work plan on vulnerable marine ecosystems and related matters.[24]

59. In addition to other measures,[25] NAFO noted that an update of its vulnerable marine ecosystems species list and a further elaboration of its exploratory fisheries protocol were expected in 2012. NAFO also participated in a workshop organized by FAO on the vulnerable marine ecosystems database, held in Rome, in December 2011, and it was developing a case study in conjunction with NAFO Contracting Parties to contribute to the project.

60. At its annual meeting in 2011, NEAFC decided to carry out extensive intersessional work to prepare for a comprehensive review of its bottom fishing regulation at its annual meeting in 2012. As part of this exercise, the Permanent Committee on Management and Science of NEAFC held a symposium in June 2012 and developed conclusions on the NEAFC regulations.[26]

61. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission agreed to establish a working group on the management of deep sea fisheries to inform management of these fisheries by WECAFC members, to promote responsible fisheries that provided economic opportunities, while ensuring the conservation of marine living resources and the protection of marine biodiversity, and facilitate the implementation of FAO guidelines.

---

[22] See also A/66/307, para. 142.
[23] See A/66/307, paras. 114-116.
[24] See A/66/307, paras. 44, 53-54, 63-64, 72-73 and 79.
[25] See A/66/307, paras. 46, 55-57, 61, 66-67, 74 and 81.
[26] See A/66/307, paras. 47-48, 58, 68-69, 75 and 82-83.

3. Activities carried out by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

62. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations expanded its programme to support implementation of FAO Guidelines, including through development of deep-sea species identification guides; guidance for impact assessments, encounter protocols and improved collaboration among stakeholders; assistance with stock assessments; an updated worldwide review of deep-sea fisheries in the high seas; and development of a database on vulnerable marine ecosystems. A full-scale programme under the Global Environment Facility for deep-sea fisheries in the high seas was also approved and would be developed over the next year.

63. The global vulnerable marine ecosystems database of FAO was expected to be available at the end of 2012. A workshop on vulnerable marine ecosystems requirements was held in Rome in December 2011, which produced a road map to support development of the database. In June 2012, a web-based discussion group was launched with a draft version of the proposed website, in order to obtain feedback. The relevant material was presented to a regional workshop on vulnerable marine ecosystems in the Indian Ocean, held in Mauritius, in July 2012.

C. Marine protected areas for fisheries purposes

64. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations developed technical guidelines on marine protected areas and fisheries, as well as reviews at the national level of management regimes for spatial management measures in the marine realm.[27] The technical guidelines considered fisheries features of marine protected areas and addressed the interface between fisheries management and biodiversity conservation, while providing guidance on implementing marine protected areas with multiple objectives where one of the primary objectives was related to fisheries management.[28]

1. Actions taken by States and the European Union

65. A number of delegations reported on efforts to establish marine protected areas for fisheries and other purposes (Bahrain, European Union, Mexico and New Zealand). The European Union reported on the development of fisheries management measures and marine protected areas in the context of its "Natura 2000" network. It noted that the Baltic Sea was the first marine region to achieve the target for the effective conservation of at least 10 per cent of each of the world's marine ecological regions by 2012.

66. New Zealand proposed the establishment of a marine protected area in CCAMLR, in the Ross Sea region, aimed at protecting the full range of marine habitats, including juvenile habitats and spawning areas of the Antarctic toothfish.

---

[27] Available at www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2090e/i2090e00.htm.

[28] See FAO, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2012*.

2. Measures taken by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and other bodies

67. The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources declared its first high seas marine protected area on the South Orkney Islands southern shelf in 2009.[29] In 2011, it adopted a general framework for the establishment of marine protected areas. CCAMLR also supported a series of technical workshops to advance the development of proposals for marine protected areas.

68. The Helsinki Commission adopted guidelines for management of the Baltic Sea Protected Areas, which took into account potential impact from fishing activities, but did not include criteria on the objectives and management of marine protected areas for fisheries purposes. It also initiated a project to address the impact of fisheries on marine protected areas, including development and implementation of fisheries management measures, which aimed to identify conflicts of use and facilitate a consultative process for a dialogue on possible measures.

D. Addressing the issue of marine debris

69. In 2011, the United States partnered with the United Nations Environment Programme to host the fifth International Marine Debris Conference. The conference developed a framework for a comprehensive and global effort to reduce the impact of marine debris in ecological and economic terms, as well as on human health, including actions to address the impact from abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear.

70. In addition, the United States conducted research and removal projects related to abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear through its marine debris programme. It also established a fishing-for-energy partnership that provided a mechanism for fishing gear to be discarded at no cost and then incinerated for energy production.

71. The parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals adopted a resolution to address the increasing impact of marine debris on marine species and their habitats. The resolution encouraged parties to identify coastal and oceanic locations where marine debris aggregated, identify and address the sources and impact of marine debris and develop and implement national plans of action addressing the negative impact of marine debris.

E. Achieving sustainable aquaculture

1. Actions taken by States and the European Union

72. A number of respondents were taking action to promote sustainable aquaculture within areas of national jurisdiction (European Union, Mexico, New Zealand and

[29] See A/66/307, para. 64.

United States).[30] The European Union reported that the reform of its Common Fisheries Policy would aim to promote a collaborative approach among member States of the Union to remove unnecessary administrative burdens, address difficulties related to accessing space and improve the competitiveness of sustainable aquaculture in the European Union and promote its high value production. It would also issue strategic guidelines for sustainable aquaculture.

73. Mexico updated its General Act on Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture of 2007 to include the concept of sustainability and highlight the role of aquaculture production. New Zealand reformed relevant legislation in 2011 to encourage sustainable aquaculture development and better enable integrated decision-making through a resource management framework. In 2011, the United States released national aquaculture policies that established a framework on sustainable domestic aquaculture.

2. Activities carried out by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

74. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported on a wide range of activities to support sustainable aquaculture. It contributed to monitoring and assessment of the aquaculture sector through the development of a user-friendly tool to facilitate data compilation and analysis and the generation and dissemination of quantitative information. It also continued to establish mechanisms to stimulate the sharing and dissemination of data to facilitate cooperation on planning for sustainable aquaculture development. FAO further promoted regional cooperation on sustainable aquaculture, with an emphasis on countries with the least developed aquaculture and small island developing States. The organization also provided technical assistance on biosecurity governance at various levels, including the application of risk analysis to aquaculture.

75. The organization published technical guidelines on the use of wild fish as feed in aquaculture in 2011, and expert and stakeholder workshops were organized to support the implementation thereof.[31] Technical guidelines on aquaculture certification were also approved at the twenty-ninth session of the Committee on Fisheries, held in 2011. At its thirtieth session, the Committee requested FAO to develop a conformity assessment framework for aquaculture certification guidelines and a technical workshop for this purpose was scheduled for November 2012.[32]

V. Addressing unsustainable fishing practices

76. Effective flag State control is essential in addressing IUU fishing, which continues to deprive many countries of a crucial natural resource and remains a

[30] To meet increasing demand, world food fish production of aquaculture has grown almost twelvefold in the last three decades, at an average annual rate of 8.8 percent. In 2010, world aquaculture produced a record of 60 million tonnes (excluding aquatic plants and non-food products), with an estimated total value of $119 billion (FAO, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2012*).

[31] "Aquaculture development. 5. Use of fish as feed in aquaculture", FAO, *Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries*. No. 5, Supplement No. 5., Rome, 2011.

[32] See FAO, *Report of the thirtieth session of the Committee on Fisheries, Rome, 9-13 July 2012*, FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report, No. 1012.

persistent threat to their sustainable development. In the light of the failure of some flag States to ensure effective control over their vessels, additional and complementary measures have been necessary, including coastal-, port- and trade-related measures.

77. To this end, the international community has recommitted to eliminating IUU fishing, as advanced in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and to prevent and combat these practices through a range of actions, including effective and coordinated measures by coastal States, flag States and port States.[33] Equally concerted and cooperative actions are also needed to address other unsustainable activities that threaten fish stocks and marine ecosystems, in particular, fishing overcapacity, by-catch and discards, and drift net fishing.

A. Compliance and enforcement and monitoring, control and surveillance

1. Actions taken by States and the European Union

78. A number of respondents reported on actions to improve monitoring, control and surveillance and enhance enforcement activities to ensure compliance with conservation and management measures (Bahrain, European Union, Kuwait, Mexico and United States). Bahrain reported on programmes for monitoring, control and surveillance that continued to uncover illegal fishing activities, but stressed the need for human and financial resources. The European Union fundamentally reformed its fisheries control system and established an all-encompassing system to ensure compliance, which made use of modern technologies and utilized a risk-based approach. It also created the European Fisheries Control Agency to organize the operational coordination of fisheries control and inspection activities.

79. Actions were taken in Kuwait to strengthen monitoring, control and surveillance in combating illegal fishing and a vessel monitoring system was under active consideration. In Mexico, vessels fishing for highly migratory species were required to use a satellite positioning and monitoring system. The United States was implementing a national vessel monitoring system that would consolidate all related information into one database and promote near real-time transmission of data. It supported an expert consultation of FAO on vessel monitoring systems, in order to foster broader implementation of satellite-based vessel monitoring and update existing FAO technical guidelines.

2. Actions taken by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements

80. Some RFMO/As were taking measures to improve monitoring, control and surveillance, including through vessel monitoring systems (CCAMLR, NAFO, NEAFC). CCAMLR promoted compliance through integrated monitoring, control and surveillance measures, including an automated vessel monitoring system. NAFO increased the frequency of posting catch reporting on vessel monitoring systems, from every two hours to every hour, and fishing vessels were requested to report daily catches by species and division.

[33] See General Assembly resolution 66/288, para. 170.

81. In NEAFC, vessel monitoring system reporting is mandatory and the data is used to make inspections focused and efficient. NEAFC parties with 10 or more vessels in a specific fishery were required to have an inspection vessel present. NEAFC was also cooperating with FAO and IMO to establish a global record of fishing vessels by supplying vessel data for a pilot run of a global record database design.

3. Activities carried out by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and other bodies

82. The African Development Bank supported African States in developing their fisheries sector, including through the provision of infrastructure for monitoring, control and surveillance. FAO undertook capacity development in Central America to continue the development of a global record of fishing vessels, refrigerated transport vessels and supply vessels. A framework was created for work to be undertaken in other regions, including the provision of existing FAO tools for strengthening national fleet registers. In July 2012, FAO initiated a promotional campaign to raise awareness of the need for a unique vessel identification number.

83. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported that implementation of phase 1 of the global record through capacity-building and pilot projects was expected for two regional areas during the five-year Global Environment Facility (GEF) project on areas beyond national jurisdiction. IMO also recalled its support for a pilot project in 2010 to test the concept of the global record with data on fishing vessels provided by NEAFC and hosted by the Global Integrated Shipping Information System of IMO.[34]

84. At the thirtieth session of the Committee, delegations reiterated their support for the continued development of the global record, using a phased approach that would avoid duplication, be cost-effective and ensure coordination with other initiatives. The Committee recognized the need for a global unique vessel identifier as a key component of the global record to identify and track vessels, which were proposed initially for vessels above 100 gross register tonnage.[32]

B. Measures to address illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing

85. Many respondents reported on a wide range of activities to address IUU fishing, including flag State, port State and trade-related measures (Bahrain, European Union, New Zealand, Philippines, Russian Federation and United States). A number of respondents were taking specific actions to implement the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (Bahrain, Russian Federation and United States). Some respondents were also taking actions to regulate at-sea transhipment activities (New Zealand, United States).

86. The European Union reported on the details of its regulation to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing, which entered into force in 2010 and aimed to prevent the marketing of IUU products in the European Union and thereby cut off profit for illegal operators. New Zealand undertook aerial and surface surveillance activities

[34] See resolution A.1029 (26) adopted by the Assembly of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), at its twenty-sixth session, on 26 November 2009.

in the Pacific Ocean and Southern Ocean regions to deter IUU fishing activities. It also worked within RFMO/As to improve measures to combat IUU fishing and with Pacific Island countries on regional initiatives to strengthen capacity and coordination. The Philippines reported that its agencies conducted 508 operations on illegal fishing and 37,505 maritime patrols covering 84,282 miles of coastline in the past 10 years.

87. The United States placed a high priority on combating IUU fishing and took numerous actions to combat these activities, including through legislation that prevented unauthorized fishing by its vessels in the jurisdiction of other States.[35] In addition, the United States Lacey Act made it unlawful for any person, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to import or export any fish taken, transported, or sold in violation of any law or regulation of the United States or any foreign law. The United States also worked at the regional level to develop regional vessel monitoring systems, IUU vessel lists and trade monitoring schemes.

88. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations continued to promote implementation of the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing as the primary means of combating IUU fishing. It noted that national plans of action had the dual purpose of promoting action against IUU fishing and assessing national policy and operational gaps with respect to IUU fishing. Implementation of the International Plan of Action also encouraged national and regional reviews of actions and measures to address IUU fishing.

1. Flag State performance

89. The second FAO technical consultation on flag State performance was held in Rome, from 5 to 9 March 2012. The purpose of the consultation was to continue the drafting of the criteria for assessing flag State performance, building on the previous meeting, which was held in 2011.[36]

90. New Zealand was actively engaged in the process with FAO and stressed that the guidelines should not create new or erode existing obligations and rights, but reflect existing rights and obligations under international law. The United States welcomed the initiative by FAO and the progress to date in developing global flag State performance criteria.

91. At the thirtieth session of the Committee, delegations noted the need for further progress in the negotiation of the draft criteria for flag State performance and requested FAO to convene the second resumed session of the technical consultation.[32]

2. Port State measures

92. In 2011, the European Union deposited its instrument of approval for the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. Other respondents reported on the initiation of internal processes to ratify the Agreement (New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States). At the thirtieth session of the Committee, 26 members gave

[35] See www.nmfs.noaa.gov/stories/iuu/.

[36] See document TC-FSP/2011/2.

indications of their ongoing processes to ratify, accept, approve or accede to the Agreement. Delegations also endorsed the terms of reference for the ad hoc working group under part 6 of the Port State Measures Agreement.[32]

93. The United States supported port State control measures in NAFO and noted that regional port State measures in line with the Port State Measures Agreement were being developed by ICCAT, WCPFC, CCAMLR and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). ICCAT was strengthening its current port inspection program by establishing minimum standards for inspection and specifying action in cases of suspected infringement.

94. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reviewed and updated its website to include information on the Port State Measures Agreement, including the benefits of ratification. It also launched a global series of regional capacity-development workshops to support implementation of the Agreement. The first workshop was convened in Bangkok, from 23 to 27 April 2012, in collaboration with the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC).[37]

3. Trade-related measures

95. The European Union negotiated provisions in preferential trade agreements aimed at improving environmental behaviour by insisting on adherence to international instruments on maritime governance, such as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In all ongoing free trade negotiations, the European Union pursued a trade and sustainable development chapter, which included good governance principles in the fisheries area. It was also setting up a decisional framework for measures targeting countries that allowed unsustainable fishing on stocks whose management responsibility was shared with the European Union.

96. Mexico established provisions for highly migratory species to monitor catches using traceability systems for marketing catches of species and by-catch associated with the protection of marine species. As a member of CCAMLR, New Zealand had a compulsory catch documentation scheme for toothfish and prohibited import and export in the absence of export documentation. In 2010, New Zealand also implemented a compulsory catch documentation scheme for imports and exports of southern bluefin tuna.

97. The United States was modernizing its customs import entry systems with an electronic interface for the submission of trade data by the private sector and the extraction of trade data by Government users to verify sources of seafood products and ensure IUU products did not gain access to markets in the United States. It was also urging IATTC to allow market-related measures as a tool to improve compliance with IATTC measures and aid in the fight against IUU fishing.

4. Cooperation and coordination in addressing IUU fishing

(a) Actions taken by States and the European Union

98. Respondents were also taking measures to enhance cooperation in combating IUU fishing activities, including development of catch documentation schemes, vessel monitoring systems, IUU vessel lists, and trade monitoring schemes in

[37] See http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/rap/files/meetings/2012/120423_prospectus.pdf.

RFMO/As (European Union, New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States). The European Union conducted investigative work with flag States and coastal States of third country and European Union vessels, which contributed to actions against vessels fishing in its waters. It also signed a joint statement in September 2011 with the United States on increased cooperation in the fight against IUU fishing. Additionally, the European Union provided administrative cooperation and technical assistance on implementation of its regulation on IUU fishing and fisheries governance.

99. New Zealand cooperated with Pacific Island countries on regional initiatives to strengthen capacity and coordination in monitoring and responding to IUU fishing. It also reported on an environmental crime summit of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and noted that the INTERPOL Ad Hoc Fisheries Crime Working Group was well positioned to consider international aspects of IUU fishing. The Russian Federation reported on efforts to conclude bilateral agreements on cooperation in combating IUU fishing. In 2011, it also held talks with Cambodia and Sierra Leone and obtained consent to suspend registration of Russian vessels in open registries.

100. The United States strongly supported the principles developed and agreed at the third joint meeting of the tuna regional fisheries management organizations to harmonize procedures for IUU vessel lists and develop processes for incorporating IUU vessels listed by other RFMO/As. It also reported on actions to identify nations whose vessels engaged in IUU fishing activities, in violation of conservation and management measures of RFMO/As to which it was a party. The United States further noted its support for the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network for Fisheries-related Activities (MCS Network) and described its capacity-building activities.

(b) Actions taken by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and other bodies

101. Several RFMO/As and other bodies took action to address IUU fishing and improve compliance with conservation and management measures (CCAMLR, ICCAT, IMO, NAFO, NEAFC and the Helsinki Commission).

102. The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources promoted compliance through vessel monitoring systems, catch documentation schemes, IUU vessel lists, surveillance cooperation, regulation of transhipment and notification systems in new, exploratory and krill fisheries. ICCAT reduced the length of possible IUU vessels to 12 metres, refined procedures for its positive vessel list and adopted measures on access agreements. It was also considering a catch certification scheme for tropical tunas. IMO, along with FAO, was organizing a third meeting of the joint FAO/IMO ad hoc working group on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and related matters.

103. The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization maintained and regularly reviewed an IUU vessel list, which was compiled with NEAFC. It shared information on IUU vessels with CCAMLR, NEAFC and the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO). NAFO was also considering membership of the MCS Network. NEAFC noted improvements to its port State control system in 2012, through the use of digital forms, as well as participation in expert meetings of the MCS Network.

104. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations supported the MCS Network by co-sponsoring the third Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop, held in Maputo, in 2011. The workshop focused on the special needs and challenges of activities related to monitoring, control and surveillance in developing countries. FAO also assisted in new initiatives, including the first Stop IUU Fishing Award, which encouraged innovations in monitoring, control and surveillance.

C. Measures to address other unsustainable fishing activities

1. Fishing overcapacity

105. Several respondents reported on efforts to reduce overcapacity in their fishing sector (Bahrain, European Union, Kuwait, New Zealand and United States). In this regard, the Pew Environment Group noted a recent study which found that global subsidies totalled approximately $27 billion, 60 per cent of which went towards unsustainable capacity-enhancing subsidies.[38]

106. Bahrain reduced pressure on fisheries by encouraging its private sector to engage in fish farming. The European Union reported on its new fisheries control system and noted that its fleet was subject to verification of engine power, including physical checks. Long-term management plans also addressed the reduction of capacity in certain fisheries. A number of measures were taken in Kuwait to reduce fishing capacity, including restrictions on new licences and prohibitions on bottom trawling.

107. New Zealand worked through RFMO/As and the joint tuna regional fisheries management organizations process to address overcapacity in the world's tuna fisheries. It also participated in the work of the Negotiating Group on Rules of WTO to strengthen disciplines on fisheries subsidies, including through a prohibition on subsidies that contributed to overfishing and overcapacity.

108. The United States conducted overcapacity workshops and assessments of excess fishing capacity in a selection of federally-managed fisheries and implemented fishing capacity reduction programmes, pursuant to its Magnuson-Stevens Act. It also limited capacity in its fisheries through limited access privilege programmes. The United States additionally reported on its involvement in WTO negotiations to clarify and improve disciplines on fisheries subsidies.

109. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported that progress in implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity varied widely among countries. While the European Union, Iceland and Norway succeeded in reducing fleet capacity in terms of number of vessels, tonnage and power, in some countries, including the Republic of Korea and Japan, the number of vessels decreased, but combined power increased. Fleets were also expanding in some other countries, including Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam, possibly due to improved monitoring and registration. In China, both the number of vessels and total combined power have increased since 2008.

[38] U. Rashid Sumaila et al., "A bottom-up re-estimation of global fisheries subsidies", *Journal of Bioeconomics*, vol. 12 (2010), pp. 201-225.

2. By-catch and discards

(a) Actions taken by States and the European Union

110. Several respondents were taking a wide range of actions to limit by-catch and discards in fisheries, including by promoting measures in RFMO/As (Bahrain, Kuwait, Mexico, New Zealand, Russian Federation and United States).

111. Bahrain was working to limit by-catch and discards in shrimp fisheries, including through redesigning nets. Kuwait was considering by-catch reduction devices for its shrimp trawlers and also planned to utilize by-catch for producing fish meal and other value-added products. Mexico promoted measures in RFMO/As to minimize by-catch and catch of juvenile fish, in particular, measures to monitor, control and reduce fishing efforts using fish aggregating devices. New Zealand was updating its national plan of action to reduce the incidental catch of seabirds, in line with the International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries.

112. The Russian Federation adopted a number of specific measures to limit by-catch and discards, including monitoring the composition of commercial catches, liberalizing fishing regulations to promote the catch of less valuable fish, stiffer penalties for discarding by-catch, mandatory introduction of advanced and selective fishing gear and certification of major fisheries through the Marine Stewardship Council.

113. The United States released a national by-catch report and national compilations of by-catch estimates for living marine resources at the fishery and species level. It also reduced by-catch through an engineering programme aimed at developing technological solutions and investigating changes in fishing practices to minimize by-catch. The United States further reported on specific actions to reduce the impacts of fishing on turtles, seabirds and marine mammals, such as research and capacity-building activities, including observer programmes in the Pacific and in West Africa.

(b) Actions taken by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and other bodies

114. In CCAMLR, the rate of incidental mortality of seabirds in its high seas fisheries continued to be near zero, as a result of a suite of mitigation measures that applied to all vessels. In accordance with its scheme of scientific observation, observers were operational in all managed fisheries and were tasked with collecting information in relation to by-catch.

115. The secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals noted that by-catch remained one of the most severe threats for migratory species and reported on the adoption of a resolution on the impact of gill net fisheries. The Helsinki Commission recalled that its Baltic Sea Action Plan called for all caught species and by-catch to be landed and reported by 2012, as well as for the urgent adoption of measures to minimize by-catch of undersized fish and non-target species by 2012.

116. The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization reduced by-catch through a range of measures, including gear restrictions, and established a working group on the ecosystem approach to fisheries management to develop effective management

measures and disseminate scientific information. NEAFC adopted a total ban on discards in 2009 and demanded retrieval of lost gear and removal of unmarked gear.

117. The Pew Environment Group reported on countries that prohibited wire leaders in longline fisheries in order to reduce shark mortality and highlighted an international symposium in 2011 on tuna fisheries and fish aggregating devices, which concluded, inter alia, that proliferation of such devices had had a negative impact on target and non-target species.

(c) Activities carried out by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

118. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations worked to implement the International Guidelines on By-catch Management and Reduction of Discards in five South-East Asian countries. Issues relating to by-catch were also addressed as part of a $178 million global tuna project of FAO-GEF and an $80 million regional tuna project of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and FAO for the Western Central Pacific. FAO further supported the publication of best practices to reduce incidental catch of seabirds in capture fisheries.

119. With respect to abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear, FAO participated in the working and correspondence groups of the Marine Environment Protection Committee of IMO to revise annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL Convention) and its guidelines. FAO also published a paper in 2012 identifying constraints and opportunities associated with low-impact and fuel-efficient fishing.

3. Global moratorium on drift-net fishing

120. In its resolution 46/215 of 20 December 1991, the General Assembly called upon all members of the international community to implement its previous resolutions 44/225 and 45/197 by, inter alia, taking the following actions:

> "(a) Beginning on 1 January 1992, reduce fishing effort in existing large-scale pelagic high seas drift-net fisheries by, inter alia, reducing the number of vessels involved, the length of the nets and the area of operation, so as to achieve, by 30 June 1992, a 50 per cent reduction in fishing effort;
>
> (b) Continue to ensure that the areas of operation of large-scale pelagic high seas drift-net fishing are not expanded and, beginning on 1 January 1992, are further reduced in accordance with paragraph 3 (a) of the present resolution;
>
> (c) Ensure that a global moratorium on all large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing is fully implemented on the high seas of the world's oceans and seas, including enclosed seas and semi-enclosed seas, by 31 December 1992."

121. The General Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session a report on the implementation of the resolution (see document A/47/487).

122. Between 1992 and 1994, the General Assembly adopted separate decisions on large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing and its impact on the living marine resources of the world's oceans and seas and requested additional reports from the

Secretary-General.[39] Thereafter, decisions of the General Assembly in this regard were made in the context of its comprehensive resolutions on fisheries-related topics.[40]

123. In its resolution 66/68,[41] the General Assembly expressed its concern that, despite the adoption of its resolution 46/215, the practice of large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing still existed and remained a threat to living marine resources. It urged States, individually and through RFMO/As, to adopt effective measures, or strengthen existing measures, to implement and enforce the provisions of its resolution 46/215 and subsequent resolutions on large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing in order to eliminate the use of large-scale pelagic drift nets in all seas and oceans, meaning that efforts to implement resolution 46/215 should not result in the transfer to other parts of the world of drift nets that contravene the resolution.

124. The General Assembly also urged States, individually and through RFMO/As to adopt effective measures, or strengthen existing measures, to implement and enforce the current global moratorium on the use of large-scale pelagic drift nets on the high seas, and called upon States to ensure that vessels flying their flag that were duly authorized to use large-scale drift nets in waters under their national jurisdiction did not use such gear for fishing while on the high seas.

(a) Actions taken by States and the European Union

125. Respondents reported on a range of actions to implement resolution 46/215, including by banning (European Union, Kuwait, New Zealand and Turkey), or restricting (Bahrain) large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing within areas of national jurisdiction. Some respondents also prohibited their nationals and fishing vessels from engaging in large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing on the high seas (European Union, New Zealand and Russian Federation). The European Union reported that the use of drift nets longer than 2.5 km was prohibited in its waters and/or outside its waters by fishing vessels of member States.

126. A number of respondents reported on gear restrictions or prohibitions, as well as spatial, temporal or effort restrictions on drift-net fishing within areas of national jurisdiction (European Union, New Zealand and Russian Federation). The European Union prohibited drift nets of any size from being used or kept on board in the Baltic Sea, the Belts and the Oresund and also in all waters, if the gears were intended for the capture of certain species. In New Zealand, it was an offence for nationals and vessels to carry drift nets on vessels, engage in transportation, trans-shipment or processing of drift-net catch, or supply and provide drift-net fishing vessels. The Russian Federation determined the total allowable catch for drift-net fishing of salmon at a sufficiently low level to prevent any impact on fishing by other methods in coastal areas.

127. Some respondents also reported on cooperative efforts, including at the regional level, to prevent illegal drift-net fishing and ensure the sound use of stocks

[39] See General Assembly decisions 47/443, 48/445 and 49/436; and reports of the Secretary-General, A/48/451 and Corr.1 and Corr.2, A/49/469 and A/50/553.

[40] See General Assembly resolutions 50/25, 51/36, 52/29, 53/33, 54/32, 55/8, 57/142, 58/14, 59/25, 60/31, 61/105, 62/177, 63/112, 64/72, 65/38 and 66/68; and reports of the Secretary-General, A/51/404, A/52/557, A/53/473, A/55/386, A/57/459, A/59/298, A/60/189, A/62/260 and A/63/128.

[41] See paras. 78-81 of the resolution. See also General Assembly resolution 65/38, paras. 75-78.

(Russian Federation and United States). The European Union also reported on legal proceedings against France and Italy for a lack of effective control and enforcement of the large-scale drift-net ban.

(b) Activities carried out by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and non-governmental organizations

128. In CCAMLR, members agreed to prohibit expansion of drift-net fishing into the CCAMLR area. They also adopted a prohibition on deep sea gill netting.

129. The Pew Environment Group noted that the use of illegal drift nets for the capture of Mediterranean swordfish and bluefin tuna by Italian vessels were well-documented and well-reported, despite a prohibition in ICCAT. Between 2005 and early 2011, more than 330 Italian vessels were identified as being involved in illegal activities with drift nets, which was the subject of a second infringement procedure by the European Union.

130. WWF International (World Wild Fund for Nature/World Wildlife Fund) stressed that ongoing industrial-scale use of pelagic drift nets, regardless of net size, posed a serious threat to target stocks, non-target species and associated ecosystems and to small-scale local fishing communities. It proposed that the global moratorium should apply to all seas and oceans and that States and RFMO/As should introduce substantial restrictions on the use of drift-net fishing gear to reduce negative impacts on salmon populations and ecosystems and on local communities substantially dependent on such fisheries.

VI. International cooperation to promote sustainable fisheries

A. Subregional and regional cooperation through regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements

1. Measures taken by States and the European Union

131. A number of respondents reported on efforts to enhance cooperation and promote sustainable fisheries, including through the development and implementation of measures in RFMO/As (Bahrain, European Union, Kuwait, Mexico, New Zealand and United States).

132. The European Union reported on a communication on the external dimension of its Common Fisheries Policy, which outlined actions aimed at, inter alia, transforming bilateral dialogues into working partnerships, strengthening the global architecture for fisheries governance, enhancing the performance of RFMO/As and reinforcing governance of bilateral fisheries agreements. The United States noted that WCPFC established memorandums of understanding with RFMO/As, as well as other regional bodies. The United States also hosted the first joint consultation of WCPFC and IATTC in July 2011.

133. New Zealand and the United States also reported on their efforts to enhance the performance of RFMO/As. New Zealand supported the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), which was established to achieve progress on important strategic and management issues, following the performance review of CCSBT in

2008. The United States welcomed progress in the conduct of performance reviews in CCAMLR, CCSBT, ICCAT, NAFO, NASCO, NEAFC, WCPFC and the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). It strongly supported a process to review the performance of ICCAT, as well as the creation by ICCAT of a working group to provide an effective forum to consider recommendations.

134. Some respondents also participated in the establishment of new RFMO/As, including through the implementation of interim measures (Russian Federation, New Zealand and United States).[42] The United States was also engaged in internal deliberative processes to consent to ratification of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, adopted by the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO).

2. Measures adopted by regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and other organizations

135. A number of RFMO/As reported on activities to enhance cooperation in the conservation and management of fish stocks, including by improving their performance and adopting modern approaches to fisheries management and by improving cooperation (CCAMLR, ICCAT, NAFO, NEAFC, WECAFC).[43]

136. The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas noted that its working group on the future of ICCAT was scheduled to meet in May 2012. It was also active in the Kobe process and was leading the Working Group on Management Strategy Evaluation and working in the framework of the tuna regional fisheries management organizations' consolidated list of authorized vessels.

137. The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization established a working group on the future of NAFO to formulate a plan of action for the short, medium and long term and to build a scientifically-based foundation for the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources. The plan was scheduled to be reviewed at its annual meeting in 2012. NEAFC reported that preparations were currently underway for a second performance review, which would take place in 2013.

138. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission agreed to cooperate with, support and strengthen existing subregional, regional and international organizations and initiatives in efforts to implement international fisheries instruments and establish new mechanisms and initiatives. It also recognized the need for cooperation and collaboration through subregional, regional and/or international mechanisms to identify priorities, harmonize actions and measures and ensure compatibility of fisheries management measures.

139. In terms of improving cooperation among regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements and with other relevant international

[42] The Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) entered into force on 21 June 2012, following ratification by Australia on 23 March 2012. The Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean (SPRFMO) entered into force on 24 August 2012, following ratification by Chile on 25 July 2012.

[43] The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) launched a task force in 2011 to improve and modernize its legal and institutional framework, as well as a framework programme to promote sustainable development and capacity-building.

organizations,[44] NAFO noted that its portion of a pelagic redfish stock was managed in conjunction with NEAFC. It also collaborated with the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea on the scientific advice for this stock and in joint working groups. It further participated in the Advisory Group for Data Communication of NEAFC.

140. The North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission had a memorandum of understanding with the OSPAR Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Commission) in the North-East Atlantic and it attended regular meetings with North Atlantic regional fisheries management organizations (ICCAT, NAFO, the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) and the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO)). It also took part in the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network.

141. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission was considering collaboration with the Caribbean Sea Commission by providing an integrative science policy interface for regional ocean policy development in the region. At a WECAFC regional policy and planning workshop, held in Barbados in 2011, participants recommended that WECAFC collaborate with regional organizations on the implementation of the Code of Conduct by organizing joint capacity-building activities and sharing information on best practices and successful experiences.

142. The Helsinki Commission contributed to sustainable fisheries in the Baltic through its Baltic Sea Action Plan and by coordinating, on a regional level, dialogue and cooperation related to the environment and fisheries. The Baltic Fisheries and Environmental Forum of the Commission brought together fisheries and environment authorities twice a year to discuss and find common ground on current issues related to the environment and fisheries in the Baltic.

143. The Interim secretariat for the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean reported that the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean opened for signature on 1 April 2012 and will enter into force 180 days after the depository (Republic of Korea) receives the fourth instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.

B. International cooperation to enhance capacity-building

1. Assistance provided by States and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements

144. A number of respondents reported on their efforts to enhance opportunities for developing States to develop sustainable fisheries and participate in high seas fisheries, including by providing financial and technical assistance (New Zealand and United States, and CCAMLR and ICCAT).

145. New Zealand provided financial and/or technical support to the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and the TeVakaMoana Arrangement on Polynesian fisheries to assist capacity development. It also worked through the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and

[44] GFCM finalized memorandums of understanding with a number of regional organizations, to be considered for adoption at its thirty-sixth session, in 2012.

Petrels (ACAP) to support capacity-building in by-catch mitigation. New Zealand additionally provided assistance to partners bilaterally, consistent with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

146. The United States reported on a wide range of capacity-building activities, including in Latin America and the Caribbean, West Africa and in Asian and Pacific countries. In regards to access agreements, the United States ensured that its vessels complied with the highest standards of reporting and monitoring, control and surveillance while fishing in the exclusive economic zone of other States, and noted the model 1987 Multilateral Treaty on Fisheries between the Governments of certain Pacific Islands States and the Government of the United States of America. The United States introduced a measure in ICCAT to increase transparency of access agreements for tuna and tuna-like species and to clarify responsibilities for ensuring that fishing was consistent with applicable ICCAT procedures.

147. New Zealand and the United States also supported the participation of developing States in RFMO/As and other relevant organizations. New Zealand advocated for measures within SPRFMO and WCPFC on the effective participation of developing States in these organizations. The United States led efforts to establish a financial assistance mechanism in the WCPFC to ensure participation of developing States in meetings and build fisheries management capacity. It also supported a mechanism in ICCAT to support full participation of developing States in the work of the Commission.

148. Among the RFMO/As,[45] CCAMLR established a General Science Capacity Fund and a scholarship for early career scientists, supported by CCAMLR members. The secretariat of CCAMLR also formalized an arrangement with ACAP and the University of Tasmania to support short-term fellowships for postgraduate study. ICCAT established a data fund to improve data collection and quality assurance and other funds for the participation of developing countries at ICCAT meetings. ICCAT also created research programmes that indirectly served to build capacity.

Activities related to the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement

149. The United States actively participated in the continuing dialogue segment during the eighth round of informal consultations of States parties to the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement, which was held in 2009, to discuss the concerns of non-parties to the Agreement, including lack of capacity and resources.

150. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea continued to disseminate information about the existence and purpose of the Assistance Fund established under part VII of the Agreement and to encourage voluntary financial contributions to the Assistance Fund.

151. According to the financial report prepared by FAO on the status of the Assistance Fund, as at 31 December 2011, the total of the contributions, together

[45] The South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO) established a special requirements fund to assist developing States parties and territories and possessions in the conservation and management of fisheries resources and development of fisheries.

with interest, amounted to $1,516,034.[46] Of the total expenditures of $61,385 in 2011, 85 per cent was used to support participation by developing States parties in technical and annual sessions of RFMO/As and 8 per cent was used to support participation in a meeting of the tuna regional fisheries management organizations. As at 31 December 2011, the balance in the Assistance Fund was $534,046.

152. The Division also prepared a compilation with a list of sources of financial assistance and other available vehicles for assistance that could be accessed by developing States to increase capacity in the conservation and management of fishery resources. The compilation also contained information on the needs of developing States with regard to capacity-building and assistance in the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks.[47]

2. Assistance provided by relevant international organizations

153. The African Development Bank supported African States in developing their fisheries sectors through the provision of infrastructure, such as landing sites, marketing and storage facilities and infrastructure for monitoring, control and surveillance, with support provided for 17 fisheries projects, at a total cost of more than $180 million. It also financed other projects indirectly through subcomponents. The Bank's fishery and aquaculture portfolio focused on institutional strengthening and research and development through regional organizations to ensure decisions were based on sound scientific, social and economic information.

154. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations initiated a global series of regional workshops focused on implementation of the Port State Measures Agreement in developing countries. It also published a guide in 2012 on the background and implementation of the Port State Measures Agreement. In coordination with WECAFC, FAO organized a regional policy and planning workshop on the Code of Conduct in Barbados, from 6 to 9 December 2011, with a focus on improving fisheries management and utilization in the Wider Caribbean region. It also supported development of a regional training course on fisheries data collection, held in Accra, and noted that a similar training course for French-speaking countries would be held in 2012.

3. Assistance needs of developing States

155. Bahrain affirmed the need for international, regional, subregional and national cooperation to combat unsustainable practices, in particular IUU fishing. The United States highlighted the need for regional fisheries management in the Wider Caribbean region, which had long been recognized, but never attained. It also noted capacity-building needs identified by Asian countries, in particular for strengthening assessments of fisheries, understanding the impact of climate change on fisheries, developing a science-based management strategy for live reef food fish, providing training to mitigate the impacts of IUU fishing, mitigating the degradation of the marine environment and conducting data collection and analysis.

---

[46] Available at: www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/fishstocktrustfund/financial_reports.htm.

[47] Available at: www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/fishstocksmeetings/compilation2009updated.pdf.

156. At the regional policy and planning workshop of WECAFC in 2011, participants identified a number of regional constraints that required attention from all stakeholders, including limited human, technical and financial resources, incomplete and outdated policy and legislative frameworks, institutional weaknesses of fisheries authorities and other relevant stakeholders, uncoordinated research efforts and access to information, and inadequate and insufficient monitoring, control and surveillance arrangements. At its fourteenth session, in 2012, WECAFC also called for support to smaller countries in data collection and analysis.

C. Cooperation and coordination within the United Nations system

157. The Division cooperated with FAO on matters concerning the legal and policy framework relevant to fisheries governance, including continued cooperation in the administration of the Assistance Fund. The Division also attended meetings of the Committee on Fisheries of FAO and consultations on the development of instruments to improve fisheries governance.

158. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations regularly participated in meetings convened by the Division, including the meetings relating to the informal consultations of States parties to the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement, the resumed Review Conference on the Agreement, the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group, and the Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea. FAO also continued to provide information within its area of competence for the annual reports of the Secretary-General on oceans and law of the sea and on sustainable fisheries.

VII. Concluding remarks

159. Considerable challenges remain in global efforts to conserve and sustainably use fisheries resources, while meeting the food security and nutritional needs of a growing population. Despite the efforts of the international community, including in response to General Assembly resolution 66/68, unsustainable fishing practices, such as overfishing, overcapacity and IUU fishing, continue to erode the resource base. These practices are compounded by a multitude of cross-sectoral impacts that threaten marine ecosystems, including climate change, pollution and habitat degradation.

160. At the recent United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Member States recognized the need to improve the conservation and sustainable use of marine fishery resources. Specific commitments were made in the outcome document ("The future we want", see General Assembly resolution 66/288) to restore fish stocks, eliminate IUU fishing, improve the performance of RFMO/As, eliminate subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing and assist developing countries in developing their national capacity to conserve, sustainably manage and realize the benefits of sustainable fisheries.

161. In support of these efforts, on 12 August 2012, the Secretary-General launched an oceans compact, "Healthy oceans for prosperity", at the international conference to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the opening for signature of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, held in Yeosu, Republic of Korea. The

initiative sets out a strategic vision for the United Nations system to deliver on its ocean-related mandates, consistent with the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, in a more coherent and effective manner, including with regard to fisheries.

162. If fisheries are to continue making a contribution to food security and economic growth, additional efforts will need to be made by the international community to promote sustainable fisheries and protect marine ecosystems, using the array of tools currently available, in particular measures and approaches found in existing international fisheries instruments. At the same time, renewed attention will need to be given to enhancing cooperation and coordination among States, including through RFMO/As, to address unsustainable fishing practices and increase capacity-building activities. Without these efforts, it is unlikely that the target contained in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, for stocks to be maintained or restored to the level that can produce the maximum sustainable yield by 2015, will be met.

Annex

List of respondents to the questionnaire

States and entities

Bahrain

Kuwait

Mexico

New Zealand

Philippines

Russian Federation

Turkey

United States of America

European Union

United Nations agencies, programmes and funds, and related organizations

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Other intergovernmental organizations

African Development Bank Group

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission)

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

World Trade Organization (WTO)

Regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements

Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)

International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)

Interim secretariat for the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC)

Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC)

Non-governmental organizations

Pew Environment Group

WWF International (World Wild Fund for Nature/World Wildlife Fund)